DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 755 IR 009 159

AUTHOR Dale, Doris C.
TITLE Career Patterns of Women Librarians with Doctorates. Occasional Paper Number 147.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Graduate School of Library Science.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 30p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, Graduate School of Library Science, 249 Armory Building, Champaign, IL 61820 ($3.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; *Career Development; Career Guidance; Career Planning; *Doctoral Degrees; Employed Women; *Females; *Librarians; *Library Science; Professional Development; Sex Discrimination

ABSTRACT

Approximately 50 percent of the 4-page questionnaires sent to a sample of 320 women librarians with doctorates were returned with usable responses for this 1977 survey requesting factual information on their education, experience, present position and salary, professional contributions, and personal characteristics. These women also responded to ten open-ended questions designed to elicit their opinions relating to: (1) choice of career, (2) opportunities for advancement to positions of leadership, (3) evidence of discrimination, and (4) guidance for women leaders in the future. Hard work, the proper educational credentials, mobility, assertiveness, and management skills were factors deemed essential for leadership roles in the decades ahead. (Author/RAA)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED197755

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Career Patterns of Women Librarians with Doctorates

by

Doris C. Dale

I200959

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Hoffman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© 1980
The Board of Trustees of The University of Illinois

# Contents

Abstract ..... 3
Introduction ..... 3
Description of Sample ..... 4
The Survey Instrument ..... 6
Description of the Respondents ..... 8
Analysis of Opinions ..... 16
Conclusion ..... 25
Appendix ..... 27
References ..... 27
Vita ..... 28

## ABSTRACT

Less than 0.5% of the 100,000 women librarians in the United States have an earned doctorate; in 1975 there were only 300 living women librarians with an earned doctorate. Approximately 50% of these women completed a questionnaire designed to describe this population in terms of education, experience, present position and salary, professional contributions, and personal characteristics. These women also responded to ten questions designed to elicit opinions relating to: (1) choice of career, (2) opportunities for advancement to positions of leadership, (3) evidence of discrimination, and (4) guidance for women leaders in the future. Hard work, the proper educational credentials, mobility, assertiveness, and management skills were factors deemed essential for leadership roles in the challenging decades ahead.

## INTRODUCTION

This study was begun in an attempt to identify all the women in the library science profession, or women who had identified themselves as librarians and who had earned the doctoral degree in the period from 1925 to 1975.[1] The first objective of this study was to identify and then describe this population in terms of the following factors: name of degree, year degree was received, number of years needed to complete degree, major subject field of doctorate, years of experience before beginning doctoral studies, geographical location of first job, title of present job, present salary, professional contributions in terms of publications and committee assignments, professional memberships held, and personal data (country of birth, age, marital status, and number of children). The second objective was to elicit the opinions of the respondents in four areas: (1) choice of career, (2) opportunities for advancement to positions of leadership, (3) evidence of discrimination, and (4) guidance for women leaders in the future.

Some statistics are necessary in order to set the stage for this study. A recent report on *The Role and Status of Women Workers in the United States and Japan* revealed that there were 32,321,000 women in the civilian labor force in the United States in March 1974. Of these women, 12.8% had completed four years or more of college.[2] Of 92,896 women who had earned master's degrees (40.1% of the total number of master's degrees conferred), 5713 received their master's degrees in library science (81.3% of the total number of master's degrees in library science awarded).[3] Of 4579 women who had

earned doctor's degrees (14.3% of the total conferred), 11 received doctor's degrees in the field of library science (28.2% of the total).[4]

Another study, carried out in 1975 by Barbara Everitt Bryant of Market Opinion Research for the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, and based on a national sample of 1522 adult women, revealed these statistics: (1) 12% of the sample listed principal occupation as professional (including administrators); (2) 8% listed individual income between $10,000 and $24,999 (less than 1% listed their income above $25,000); and (3) 10% graduated from college, and 5% listed postgraduate education.[5]

The 1970 U.S. census reported a total of 123,144 librarians in the labor force. Of these, 22,819 were men and 100,325 (81.5%) were women.[6] Carpenter and Carpenter reported that the median salary for women with the doctorate in library science, exclusive of library school deans, was $13,800, while the median salary for men with the doctorate was $18,300.[7] The Carpenters, who completed this study in 1970, identified 107 persons with library science doctorates, excluding library school deans.

Schlachter and Thomison in a 1974 bibliography listed 660 library science dissertations completed between 1925 and 1972, and Davis in 1976 identified 667 doctoral dissertations in library science accepted by accredited library schools during 1930-75. Clearly there has been a tremendous growth in the number of library science dissertations completed in the years following 1970.

## DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

In addition to searching the bibliographies of Schlachter and Thomison and of Davis, several other sources were used to identify the population (see table 1). Although Schlachter and Thomison reported that of the 660 dissertations listed, 201 were by women, an additional 9 were identified by correspondence. Harrison's bibliography revealed an additional 48 women with an MLS degree and a doctorate in another subject field. These subject fields included education, languages, history, English, geography, philosophy, political science, linguistics, microbiology, music, pharmacology, psychology, and religion.

An attempt was made to search all bibliographies which might yield names of women in the library profession or who identified themselves as

## TABLE 1

### Sources Used for Identification of Population, 1925-75

| | *Number of Dissertations Listed* | *Number by Women* |
|---|---|---|
| Schlachter, Gail A., and Thomison, Dennis. *Library Science Dissertations 1925-1972: An Annotated Bibliography.* Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, 1974. | 660 | 210 |
| Davis, Charles H., comp. *Doctoral Dissertations in Library Science: Titles Accepted by Accredited Library Schools 1930-1975.* Ann Arbor, Mich., University Microfilms, 1976. | 667 | 67* |
| Harrison, Bruce. *Information Addicts Make Their Fix (or Nix) with Limericks and Codex-Mix and Sixty Other Secret Tricks.* Filer, Idaho, C & R Press, 1973. | 594 | 48 |
| "Library Media." *In* Ray L. Anderton and Joseph L. Mapes, comps. *Doctoral Research in Library Media Completed and Underway.* Boulder, School of Education, University of Colorado, 1970, pp. 27-29. | 20 | 1 |
| "Library." *In* Charles D. Kirschner, et al. *Doctoral Research in Educational Media 1969-1972.* Stanford, Calif., ERIC, 1975, pp. 36-42. | 46 | 2 |
| Branyan, Brenda M. "Outstanding Women Who Promoted the Concept of the Unified School Library and Audio-visual Programs, 1950 through 1975." Ph.D. diss., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1978. | 26 | 15 |
| Library school catalogs and personal knowledge | | 14 |
| Total | | 357 |
| (Less two names under two spellings) | | (2) |
| TOTAL—Original Population | | 355 |

*This number and the following ones in this column are in addition to the 210 identified in Schlachter and Thomison, and are not the total number of women whose dissertations were included in these sources.

librarians or library educators, whether or not their master's degree in library science was from a program accredited by the American Library Association, and whether or not their doctorate was in the field of library science. Women with a master's degree in related fields such as educational media or technology were included if their doctoral dissertation was in the subject area of library science. Women with a doctorate in a subject field other than librarianship were included if their master's degree was in library science or a related field. Women were identified in these sources by their first names. If the first name was not clearly either that of a male or female (and this was especially difficult to determine for foreign names), letters were sent to officials of library schools or alumni offices asking them to identify the sex of the persons listed. Seventeen such letters were sent, and replies were received from all except one. By this method, 52 names were checked; 37 were identified as male, 13 as female, and 2 were not identified. This method of identifying women was not foolproof: two persons who were sent questionnaires returned them and identified themselves as men.

The original sample included a total of 355 women with doctorates; this constituted 0.354% of the 100,325 women librarians in the labor force in 1970—a very small group of women who obviously might be expected to hold positions of leadership in the library profession. Addresses were located for 304 women (85.6% of the original sample) by searching several directories (see the Appendix). This seemed to indicate that a large percentage of these women remained active in the profession. For the 51 women whose addresses could not be located in this way, letters were sent to alumni offices. Twenty-nine letters were sent, and 24 addresses were provided; 8 women were reported as having no address on file in the alumni office, and 12 women were reported as deceased. The five letters for which no replies were received included six names. Some of this information was received too late to use.

## THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A four-page questionnaire was developed which consisted of four parts. Questions designed to obtain factual data were grouped into three parts: Education and Employment (questions 1-20), Professional Contributions (questions 21-24), and Personal Data (questions 25-28). The last part of the questionnaire consisted of ten open-end questions (29-38) designed to elicit opinion statements.

A total of 320 questionnaires were mailed in the fall of 1977; 35 persons in the original sample were not sent questionnaires (16 were deceased, no

addresses were available for 18, and the researcher excluded herself from the study). Questionnaires were sent to Canada, a few foreign countries, and to every zip code geographical region in the United States (see table 2).

TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES SENT AND RETURNED BY ZIP CODE REGION

| *Area* | *Sent* | *Returned* | *Percentage Returned* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Canada | 11 | 3 | 27.3 |
| Foreign countries | 6 | 3 | 50.0 |
| 000 | 27 | 13 | 48.1 |
| 100 | 59 | 41 | 69.5 |
| 200 | 27 | 17 | 63.0 |
| 300 | 35 | 16 | 45.7 |
| 400 | 39 | 25 | 64.1 |
| 500 | 15 | 12 | 80.0 |
| 600 | 35 | 16 | 45.7 |
| 700 | 26 | 14 | 53.8 |
| 800 | 9 | 4 | 44.4 |
| 900 | 31 | 17 | 54.8 |
| Postmark not clear | | 5 | |
| Total | 320 | 186 | 58.1 |

The largest number of questionnaires, 59, was sent to zip code area 100, which comprises Delaware, New York and Pennsylvania. Questionnaires were returned from every area. Only for the questionnaires sent to Canada did the percentage of returns fall below 40%. The largest number of returns, 80%, was received from zip code area 500, which comprises Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Of the 320 questionnaires sent, 186 (or 58.1%) were returned. Of the 186 responses, 161 (or 86.5%) were usable. This represented 50.3% of the 320 questionnaires sent. Twenty-five of the responses were not usable for a number of reasons. These included two who identified themselves as men, seven who were not librarians, one who did not have a doctorate, four who were deceased, one who had moved out of the country, two who did not wish to respond, five for which there were no forwarding addresses, and three who reported receiving their doctorates after 1975. The two who did not wish to respond felt that the questionnaire was too personal or that it would be too easy for the researcher to identify the respondent. Because of the elite nature of this group, the latter was true. Over a dozen respondents identified themselves; others were relatively easy to identify because of the

researcher's personal knowledge of their careers. Every attempt was made in this study to preserve the anonymity of the respondents. Without their careful answers to all of the questions, this study would not have been possible. The data presented in the remainder of this paper represent the characteristics and opinions of slightly over 50% of the total population.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Almost three-quarters of the respondents, 118 (73.2%), earned the Ph.D. Another 14 (8.6%) earned an Ed.D., while 28 (17.3%) held the DLS. One woman held a foreign doctoral degree. Over one-half of the degrees, 95 (59.0%), were earned in the years 1970-75. Only four (2.4%) were earned in the 1930s (see table 3). Almost three-quarters of the respondents, 117 (72.6%), completed their doctoral degrees in five years or less. Only three (1.8%) took more than ten years to complete their doctorates (see table 4).

TABLE 3
NAME OF DEGREE AND YEAR RECEIVED

| | *Ph.D.* | *Ed.D.* | *DLS* | *Other* | *Total* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1930-39 | 4 | | | | 4 | 2.5 |
| 1940-49 | 7 | | | | 7 | 4.3 |
| 1950-59 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 8.1 |
| 1960-69 | 24 | 4 | 13 | | 41 | 25.5 |
| 1970-75 | 73 | 8 | 14 | | 95 | 59.0 |
| Year not given | 1 | | | | 1 | 0.6 |
| Total | 118 | 14 | 28 | 1 | 161 | 100.0 |
| Percentage | 73.3 | 8.7 | 17.4 | 0.6 | 100.0 | |

TABLE 4
NUMBER OF YEARS TAKEN TO COMPLETE DOCTORAL DEGREE

| | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 - 5 | 117 | 72.7 |
| 6 - 10 | 35 | 21.7 |
| 11 - 15 | 3 | 1.9 |
| No response | 6 | 3.7 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 |

Just over 90% (146) of the women holding doctorates earned their first professional degrees from library science programs accredited by the American Library Association (only one of these professional degrees was at the bachelor's level); and 117 (72.6%) earned their doctoral degrees in the subject field of library science or information science. The field of education was listed as the subject field of the doctorate by 26 (16.1%) of the women. Fifteen women (9.3%) earned their doctorates in the humanities (six in history; four in literature; and one each in archives, art history, communications, philosophy, and religion). Only two women (1.2%) listed science as the major subject field of their doctorates (see table 5).

TABLE 5
MAJOR SUBJECT FIELD OF DOCTORATE, BY TYPE OF MASTER'S DEGREE

| | *First Professional Degree from ALA-Accredited Program* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Yes* | *No* | *No response* | *Total* | *Percentage* |
| Library/Information Science | 112 | 5 | | 117 | 72.7 |
| Education | 18 | 7 | 1 | 26 | 16.1 |
| Humanities | 13 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 9.3 |
| Sciences | 2 | | | 2 | 1.2 |
| No response | 1 | | | 1 | 0.6 |
| Total | 146 | 13 | 2 | 161 | 99.9 |
| Percentage | 90.7 | 8.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 | |

The 13 respondents (8%) who indicated that their master's degrees were not from ALA-accredited programs were asked to respond to the following question: "Has this hampered your career goals or advancement opportunities in any way; and if so, in what way?" One woman did not respond to the question, and two reported that they did not have a master's degree. Eight (61.5%) answered "no." Only two responded in the affirmative—one said that some doctoral programs rejected candidates on this basis alone, and another stated that the advertisements of job openings frequently indicated that a degree from a program accredited by ALA was one of the qualifications necessary for employment.

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of years of library experience or teaching experience they had before they began work on their doctoral degrees (see table 6). In some instances, the years in each category overlapped—a woman might be working as a librarian and also teaching

part-time, or a school librarian might also be teaching in the classroom. Very few women had no experience or less than one year of library experience before beginning their doctorate. On the other hand, a large number (98, or 60.8%) reported none or less than one year of teaching experience at the elementary or high school level, and 96 (59.6%) reported none or less than one year of teaching experience at the college or university level. Over one-half (96, or 59.6%) had 1-10 years of library experience before beginning doctoral work; and another one-fourth (41, or 25.4%) had 11-20 years of library experience. Six (3.7%) reported over 20 years of library experience before beginning doctoral work. In regard to teaching experience, 57 (35.3%) reported from one to ten years of teaching experience at the elementary or high school level, and 61 (37.8%) reported one to ten yeras of teaching experience at the college or university level before beginning doctoral work.

TABLE 6

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE BEFORE BEGINNING DOCTORAL DEGREE

| | *Library Experience* | | *Teaching Experience* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Elementary or High School* | | *College or University* | |
| | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* |
| None or less than 1 | 18 | 11.2 | 98 | 60.9 | 96 | 59.6 |
| 1 - 5 | 53 | 32.9 | 45 | 28.0 | 50 | 31.1 |
| 6 - 10 | 43 | 26.7 | 12 | 7.4 | 11 | 6.8 |
| 11 - 15 | 22 | 13.7 | 3 | 1.9 | 3 | 1.9 |
| 16 - 20 | 19 | 11.8 | 2 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 21+ | 6 | 3.7 | 1 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 | 161 | 100.0 | 161 | 100.0 |

As reflected in table 7, many women (42, or 26.0%) accepted their first position in the same city where their doctoral degree-granting institutions were located. Although this may be regarded as an indication of lack of mobility, that fact was not ascertained from the data. Another 25 (15.5%) accepted a position in the same state, and 29 (18.0%) accepted an offer in a neighboring state. Therefore, slightly more than one-half (96, or 59.6%) accepted a position in close proximity to the institution granting the doctoral degree. At the other end of the scale, 46 women (28.5%) accepted a position outside the region in which their doctoral degree-granting insti-

tutions were located, and 14 (8.6%) accepted a position in the same geographical region, but not the home or neighboring state.

TABLE 7
LOCATION OF FIRST JOB IN RELATION TO LOCATION OF DOCTORAL DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTION

| | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| Same city | 42 | 26.1 |
| Same state | 25 | 15.5 |
| Neighboring state | 29 | 18.0 |
| Same geographical region | 14 | 8.7 |
| Outside region | 46 | 28.6 |
| No response | 5 | 3.1 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 |

Respondents were asked to give the title of their present jobs; these titles were placed into categories in table 8. If both an administrative title and a professorial rank were indicated, the administrative title was chosen for this enumeration. Only two women (1.2%) indicated that they were not working; three (1.8%) listed part-time or volunteer work; and ten (6.2%) were retired. Four (2.4%) were doing free-lance or consulting work, and seven (4.3%) were in some area of research, either library research or scientific or technical research. Slightly over one-half of the women (84, or 52.0%) were in library or university education, reflecting the need for the doctorate to qualify for a position on a university faculty. Only one of these women was a professor of English. The remainder were on library school faculties. Only eight (4.9%) were in the field of school librarianship. Fourteen women (8.6%) were subject or functional department heads or specialists, such as head of reference or circulation services, head of health sciences, Latin American bibliographer, or a similar position at the middle-management level. At the upper administrative level were 42 women (26.0%), about one-fourth of the sample; 13 of these women were library school administrators, either deans or assistant deans; 20 were library administrators, either directors or assistant directors; 4 were in college or university administration; and 5 were in library administrative positions at the state or federal level.

There were 27 respondents (16.7%) who did not answer the question about present salary—the largest percentage of nonresponses to a question in this

TABLE 8
TITLE OF PRESENT JOB BY CATEGORY

| | *Number of women* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| School librarian/Director of media services | 8 | 5.0 |
| Lecturer | 2 | 1.2 |
| Assistant professor | 25 | 15.5 |
| Associate professor | 24 | 14.9 |
| Professor | 20 | 12.4 |
| Library school administrator | 13 | 8.1 |
| Subject or functional department head/specialist | 14 | 8.7 |
| Library administrator | 20 | 12.4 |
| College/University administrator | 4 | 2.5 |
| State/National level library administrator | 5 | 3.1 |
| Researcher | 7 | 4.3 |
| Free-lance/Consultant | 4 | 2.5 |
| Retired | 10 | 6.2 |
| Part-time/Volunteer | 3 | 1.9 |
| Not working | 2 | 1.2 |
| Total | 161 | 99.9 |

section of the survey instrument, evidently indicating that this was an area of some sensitivity. In some instances, a 12-month salary was reported, and in some a 9-month salary, especially for faculty members.

The median salary for women with a doctorate in library science (excluding library school deans) in 1970, as reported by Carpenter and Carpenter, was $13,800. Some progress has been made since then (much of it probably due to inflation), as over one-half of the women (85, or 52.7%) were in the salary range $15,001-$25,000. However, only 22 women (13.5%) were making over $30,000. Clearly, the possession of a doctorate in library science does not automatically mean a higher salary. It was encouraging to see that three women were earning salaries of $45,001-$50,000. None made over $50,000 (see table 9).

Two questions in the first part of the questionnaire were not analyzed, because the data received were insufficient to do so. These questions dealt with the number of years spent at each faculty rank for library educators, and the number of years spent at each administrative level for library administrators.

TABLE 9

CURRENT SALARIES OF WOMEN LIBRARIANS WITH DOCTORATES

| | *Number* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| Under $10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| $10,001-15,000 | 5 | 3.1 |
| $15,001-20,000 | 45 | 28.0 |
| $20,001-25,000 | 40 | 24.8 |
| $25,001-30,000 | 22 | 13.7 |
| $30,001-35,000 | 11 | 6.8 |
| $35,001-$40,000 | 7 | 4.3 |
| $40,001-45,000 | 1 | 0.6 |
| $45,001-50,000 | 3 | 1.9 |
| No response | 27 | 16.8 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 |

The last question in the first section of the questionnaire was: "If you have left the library profession, describe your reasons for doing so." Of the 9 women (not including the retirees) who indicated that they had left the library profession, 4 had moved into college or university administrative positions, 1 was a professor in English, and 1 was the director of a mission school. Two were not working—one had left the profession because of marriage and one for reasons of ill health. One indicated that she was leaving the profession because she was in a dead-end job and there was no opportunity for advancement.

In replying to the questions in the second section of the questionnaire, regarding the number of titles published in each category (books, monographs, journal articles, chapters in books, reviews, papers delivered) and the number of committees served on at the national, state and local levels, many respondents left some of the categories blank. These blank spaces were tabulated as "no response" in table 10 and were added to the number of responses of "none" or "zero" in a particular category. In three categories, over half of the women did not respond or indicated no publications or no committee assignments—54% of the women had not written a book or gave no response, 59% had written no chapters in books or failed to respond, and 67.7% had not written a monograph or failed to respond. The high percentage in the last category was due in part to the fact that the term *monograph* was not defined and some women questioned this item.

It is evident from table 10 that the respondents had made many professional contributions—45.9% had written at least one book, 32.2% had written a monograph, 81.3% had written a journal article, 40.9% had

## TABLE 10
### Professional Contributions

| | *1-5* | *6-10* | *11-15* | *16+* | *Total* | *Percentage* | *None* | *No response* | *Total* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Publications | | | | | | | | | | |
| Books | 72 | 1 | 1 | | 74 | 46.0 | 13 | 74 | 87 | 54.0 |
| Monographs | 44 | 8 | | | 52 | 32.3 | 15 | 94 | 109 | 67.7 |
| Journal articles | 73 | 29 | 8 | 21 | 131 | 81.4 | 3 | 27 | 30 | 18.6 |
| Chapters in books | 59 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 66 | 41.0 | 11 | 84 | 95 | 59.0 |
| Reviews | 39 | 11 | 6 | 28 | 84 | 52.2 | 8 | 69 | 77 | 47.8 |
| Papers delivered | 51 | 19 | 7 | 28 | 105 | 65.2 | 2 | 54 | 56 | 34.8 |
| Committees | | | | | | | | | | |
| National | 77 | 18 | 7 | 8 | 110 | 68.3 | 8 | 43 | 51 | 31.7 |
| State | 69 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 94 | 58.4 | 11 | 56 | 67 | 41.6 |
| Local | 47 | 20 | 7 | 12 | 86 | 53.4 | 13 | 62 | 75 | 46.6 |

written a chapter in a book, 52.1% had written a review, and 65.2% had delivered a paper. It is interesting to note that 21 women wrote 16 or more journal articles, 28 wrote 16 or more reviews, and 28 delivered 16 or more papers.

More than half of the women had served on committees at each of the three levels specified—68.3% at the national level, 58.3% at the state level, and 53.4% at the local level. In all categories except that of monographs published, over 40% of the women had made some professional contributions.

A large number of the women (132, or 81.9%) belonged to ALA (see table 11). This, of course, facilitated the identification of addresses preparatory to sending out the questionnaires. Over one-half (83, or 51.5%) belonged to the Association of American Library Schools. This correlated perfectly with the 83 women who identified themselves as being in library education. Over one-half had been elected to Beta Phi Mu (87, or 54.0%); only 12 (7.4%) had been elected to Phi Delta Kappa. Only 28 (17.3%) belonged to the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Under the category "other" on the questionnaire, 14 (8.6%) listed the American Association of University Professors, and 46 (28.5%) listed state or regional associations. There were not enough responses to the last question in the second section (relating to awards, honors and fellowships) to provide meaningful data, so this information was not tabulated.

TABLE 11
PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

| *Association* | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| American Library Association | 132 | 82.0 |
| Association for Educational Communications and Technology | 28 | 17.4 |
| Association of American Library Schools | 83 | 51.6 |
| Beta Phi Mu | 87 | 54.0 |
| Phi Delta Kappa | 12 | 7.5 |
| American Association of University Professors | 14 | 8.7 |
| State or regional associations | 46 | 28.7 |

The third section of the questionnaire, which asked for personal data, was marked optional, but most respondents gave the information requested. The United States was the country of birth listed by 141 women, or 87.5%

(see table 12). Only 3 women (1.8%) were age 30 or younger. Almost half of the women (80, or 49.6%) were in the age range of 31-50, which indicated that at least 15 years remained in their professional lives before retirement. An additional 56 women (34.6%) were in the age range of 51-65, an age level at which it becomes increasingly difficult to make a major move because of accumulated retirement benefits, family, and professional ties. Thirteen (8.0%) were age 66 and older; and only 9 women (5.5%) failed to give their age, indicating a minimum of sensitivity about age (see table 13).

An equal number of women (64, or 39.7%) indicated themselves as single and as married; 17 (10.5%) were divorced; 8 (4.9%) were widowed; and 8 (4.9%) did not respond to this question (see table 14). Just over one-half (83, or 51.5%) indicated that they had no children. Subtracting the 64 single women from this group leaves 19 married women who had no children, or 11.8% of the respondents. Only three (1.8%) reported having five children. No woman reported having more than five children. In some instances the number of children reported included adopted children or step-children (see table 15). Eight women (4.9%) failed to respond to this question.

TABLE 12
PERSONAL DATA: COUNTRY OF BIRTH

| *Country/Continent* | *Number* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| USA | 141 | 87.6 |
| Canada | 7 | 4.3 |
| Latin America | 2 | 1.2 |
| Europe | 4 | 2.5 |
| Asia | 3 | 1.9 |
| Australia | 1 | 0.6 |
| No response | 3 | 1.9 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 |

## ANALYSIS OF OPINIONS

The last ten questions on the questionnaire were open-ended, designed to elicit opinions in four areas from this elite corps of women librarians with a doctorate: (1) choice of career, (2) opportunities for advancement to positions of leadership, (3) evidence of discrimination, and (4) guidance for women leaders in the future. This was the most difficult portion of the questionnaire to construct, as opinion questions are always subject to various interpretations.

## TABLE 13
### Personal Data: Age

| | *Number* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| Under 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 26-30 | 3 | 1.9 |
| 31-35 | 10 | 6.2 |
| 36-40 | 21 | 13.0 |
| 41-45 | 19 | 11.8 |
| 46-50 | 30 | 18.6 |
| 51-55 | 22 | 13.7 |
| 56-60 | 23 | 14.3 |
| 61-65 | 11 | 6.8 |
| 66 and over | 13 | 8.1 |
| No response | 9 | 5.6 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 |

## TABLE 14
### Personal Data: Marital Status

| | *Number* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| Single | 64 | 39.7 |
| Married | 64 | 39.7 |
| Divorced | 17 | 10.5 |
| Widowed | 8 | 5.0 |
| No response | 8 | 5.0 |
| Total | 161 | 99.9 |

## TABLE 15
### Personal Data: Number of Children

| *Number of Children* | *Number of Women* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 83 | 51.6 |
| 1 | 22 | 13.7 |
| 2 | 24 | 14.9 |
| 3 | 15 | 9.3 |
| 4 | 6 | 3.7 |
| 5 | 3 | 1.8 |
| No response | 8 | 5.0 |
| Total | 161 | 100.0 |

From the nature of the answers, it seemed that the questionnaire provided some women an opportunity to vent opinions on the subjects presented. Appreciation is sincerely extended to those women who took the time to answer these questions so carefully. This section of the questionnaire did not lend itself to rigorous statistical analysis. At best, the responses gave some general impressions and perhaps some guidance for future leaders.*

The third and fourth questions were not applicable for the 54 respondents who answered the second question in the negative, and this resulted in a lower response rate for these two questions. For the remaining eight questions, the response rate in all cases was 55% or more; the mean response rate for the eight questions was 78.1 percent (see table 16).

TABLE 16
RESPONSE RATE FOR OPEN-END QUESTIONS

| *Question Number* | *Responses* | *No Response* | *Percentage Responding* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 155 | 6 | 96.3 |
| 2 | 134 | 27 | 83.2 |
| 3 | 78 | 83 | 48.4 |
| 4 | 64 | 97 | 39.8 |
| 5 | 153 | 8 | 95.0 |
| 6 | 136 | 25 | 84.5 |
| 7 | 107 | 54 | 66.5 |
| 8 | 96 | 65 | 59.6 |
| 9 | 89 | 72 | 55.3 |
| 10 | 137 | 24 | 85.1 |

Some attempt was made in analyzing the data to place all of the responses into categories. Broad categories were used to ensure anonymity. This process was subject to possible misinterpretation and oversimplification. With this in mind, each question was individually analyzed as follows.

The first question was: "List the most important factor which influenced your choice of librarianship as a career." More respondents answered this question than any of the others in this section. Only six failed to respond, for a response rate of 96.2%. The love of books and libraries, the "I like to read" claim, intellectual curiosity, an interest in or aptitude for the work, or a love of working with people, including children and young people, were factors cited by 58 women. A specific person (a librarian, teacher, friend, family member), an experience in a specific library, or reading

*On the questionnaire, these questions were numbered 29-38. In this section of the paper, however, they will be numbered 1-10 for ease of reference.

about librarianship in a journal article were factors listed by 37 women. Previous work in a library, either in a clerical position or as a student library assistant, or a library course taken as an undergraduate were listed by 19 women. Availability of library school training sometimes on a part-time basis, availability of financial assistance, availability of positions, opportunities available for women, or an easy field in which to find a job characterized the responses of 17 women. Negative factors were given by ten women. These included: "no other choice," "one of the few fields open to women," "lack of opportunities in chosen field," "didn't get into medical school," "couldn't get a teaching job," and "didn't want to teach." Nine women listed the factor of accidental choice or luck, four wanted to work in an academic environment, and one listed health.

The second question was: "If you could have been anything you wanted to be, would you have chosen another field? If so, name it." No response was given on 27 questionnaires (16.8%), and 54 (33.5%) responded "no." Another 31 listed the professional fields of medicine, law or business. In some cases, two or three of these fields were mentioned. Seven women wanted to be professors in specific subject areas, such as history, English or sociology. Six listed mathematics or science, five listed some field of engineering, and five listed a career in one of the performing arts, such as pianist or actress. Four women wanted to be architects or illustrators, four wanted to be anthropologists or achaeologists, and three wanted to be writers. Four indicated that they found the question difficult to answer. Other fields mentioned included musicology, art history, journalism, international studies, university administration, veterinary medicine, history, psychology, clothes design, ski instruction, or simply being "rich."

The third and fourth questions were applicable only if the second question was answered in the affirmative—80 women (49.7%) did so; 54 (33.5%) responded in the negative. It would be expected that these 54 women would therefore not answer the third and fourth questions; however, some of them did. Moreover, a sizable group who answered the second question affirmatively failed to respond to these two questions. A total of 83 women did not respond to the third question, and 97 did not respond to the fourth question.

The third question was: "What prevented you from going into the field you named above?" The lack of encouragement, the lack of models, or an unawareness of the preferred choice until later in one's career were factors listed by 28 women. Financial restrictions, such as the lack of funds to pursue the preferred choice, the inability to earn a living in that field, the lack of opportunity for women in that field, or the fact that financial

assistance was available to study library science were factors listed by 15 women. Ten women were denied admission to or a fellowship in the program of their choice, but this was not always because of sex discrimination. Another five women did enter the field of their first choice but changed later and after becoming librarians, liked that choice better. Three women either said nothing or responded that circumstances prevented going into the preferred field. Two women listed nepotism rules. Poor counseling or the fact that the U.S. *Occupational Outlook Handbook* advised against entering the chosen field were factors listed by two women.

The fourth question was: "If librarianship was your second career choice, what influenced you to change?" A total of 97 women did not respond to this question, including the 54 to whom the question was not applicable. An evolving interest or a new interest in librarianship, sometimes brought about by work in the previous career (such as teaching), were factors listed by 24 women. Eleven women listed various types of economic circumstances, such as the need to rear children; and nine listed the availability or practicability of library courses, sometimes at night or on Saturdays, or the fact that no specific undergraduate degree was required to enter library school. Seven cited the lack of opportunities for advancement or the lack of intellectual challenge in previous jobs, a declining enrollment in foreign languages, or the fact that they couldn't get jobs in the initial field. Five women believed that there were job opportunities available in libraries, or they wanted to work in a college or university environment. Sometimes the opportunities were not known when they first chose their career. Four felt that they lacked the talent or temperament for the first career choice, three cited the influence of a specific person, and one cited health.

The fifth question was: "After you received your doctoral degree, were more opportunities for advancement open to you? If so, describe." Only eight women did not respond to this question. The overwhelming number of women, 113 (70.1%), responded affirmatively. Many women were promoted or received salary raises because of the doctorate. Many women said that different if not more opportunities were available, such as overseas work, consulting work, or college or university teaching. Of this group, 58 women specifically cited teaching at the college or university level, where the possession of a doctorate is now a necessity. Negative responses were indicated by 33 women, and some qualified their responses by saying that opportunities were not available unless they wanted to go into administration, which they did not want to do. Seven women admitted they had not sought other opportunities, or that they were happy where they were.

More individual factors, incidents, or suggestions were listed for the last five questions than for the previous five, making it especially difficult to

analyze these responses and place them in broad categories. However, an attempt was made to do this. Interpretations of the responses were solely the responsibility of the researcher.

The sixth question was: "What factors have prevented or inhibited advancement to leadership positions for you?" Twenty-five women did not respond to this question. Another 45 women answered that no factors prohibited advancement to leadership positions for them. Fifteen others cited their own choice in not seeking higher-level leadership positions. These women did not want administrative positions, or they were in ideal or satisfying positions with sufficient salaries. Geographical limitations were cited by 13 women; often they were reluctant to move because of their husbands' positions, their age, or home ownership. Related to this limitation were the responses of the nine women who listed "being a woman" as an inhibiting factor and the five who listed marriage and children and the difficulty of juggling two careers. Another 12 listed personal characteristics, such as a lack of confidence or the lack of public speaking skills, as inhibitive. Being a woman in a man's world, especially in the academic environment of a college or university, and the fact that the "good old boys" did not consider women suitable for top positions, were factors cited by eight women. Getting a late start in the profession or a lack of careful planning for one's career was noted five times, as was the lack of time, a heavy teaching load, or extensive responsibilities. Four women cited health reasons, and three cited the lack of library experience or lack of management experience in business as inhibitive. Each of the following reasons was cited by two women: lack of interesting or top positions (there is only one head librarian in each library), lack of the doctorate before finally obtaining it, and race or religion. Only one woman cited not knowing the right people.

The seventh question was: "If you have reached a position of leadership, what influences were most beneficial?" A total of 54 women did not respond to this question. Three women responded that they didn't know, and two stated they were not yet in positions of leadership. Perhaps the 54 women who did not respond felt this way also, although a few women noted that this question was difficult to answer or was not clear. The encouragement and expectations of others—husbands, families, instructors, colleagues, suitable role models as examples—was cited by 33 women. Many of the people mentioned were men. Having the proper educational credentials, including an outstanding undergraduate education and the doctorate (in one case made possible by a Title II fellowship), were beneficial influences noted by 15 women. Knowing the "right" people who were powerful and influential, and/or serving on important or influential boards and committees were noted by 14 women. Being in the right place at

the right time, or being in a major institution was cited by another five women. Ten women cited hard work or the time to devote to the job due to being single; eight women cited professional ability, competence, and integrity, including the publication of research and other writings; four cited teaching or library experience, including business experience; and four cited interpersonal abilities and assertiveness training. Three noted the factor of mobility. Two gave credit to affirmative action policies and the women's movement. Two cited their language abilities. Interestingly, one gave credit to the recognition of librarians as faculty, and one to the civil service status of librarians.

The next two questions dealt with overt and covert discrimination, and although a sizable group of women did not respond to these questions, the answers given reveal in some instances specific, flagrant cases of discrimination, and in some instances simply vague feelings of discrimination. Some women cited very specific instances, including names and dates. To protect the anonymity of the respondents, these, of course, are not reported here. Again, an effort was made to categorize the data.

The eighth question was: "If you have been overtly discriminated against as a woman at any time in your professional career, would you describe the specific incident?" A total of 65 women did not answer this question; 43 responded that they had not been overtly discriminated against; and 53 women reported specific incidents or impressions. Hiring or promotion procedures were cited by 15 women. Most of these cases involved being turned down for jobs or promotions because the employers wanted a man, because they considered the woman too aggressive, or because men could not work for women. In two instances, women were not hired by other women because they had the Ph.D. degree and the employer did not. Salary differentials were noted by 13 women; men with equal or often less experience had higher salaries, or women held the administrative positions but did not earn equitable salaries. Nine women cited general attitudes of male colleagues, the fact that women were never considered the equals of men. Four women were discouraged from doing advanced work by a director, dean or counselor. Two women cited clubs or organizations which banned women as a discriminatory practice. At least one woman cited each of the following incidents of discrimination: no placement assistance available in library school, fellowship denied because she had a husband to support her, questions about marital status asked in a job interview, because of children, because of being single, because of nationality, exclusion from committees, forgotten when the group got together, because in an emergency it was felt she could not do the job, and because of the Ph.D.

The ninth question dealt with covert discrimination, and many respondents felt that this was more difficult to answer. The incidents were not easy to identify. The ninth question was: "If you have been covertly discriminated against as a woman at any time in your professional career, would you describe the circumstances?" A total of 72 women did not respond to this question, 32 women responded that they did not feel that they had been covertly discriminated against, and 57 reported some incidents of discrimination. Ten women reported that they probably were discriminated against, sometimes often, but that the incidents were difficult to describe. Some women reported that in the last two or three years much of this type of discrimination had disappeared—an encouraging fact. Twelve women cited low salaries or salary differentials. Eleven women believed that men were hired or promoted first, that females were not allowed to reach the same level as men, and that the "old boy" network was still operative. Five cited the lack of support or encouragement from male colleagues or male administrators. Five cited the "she can't" syndrome—she can't do the particular job because she is married/she has children/she is too emotional/she will not be interested/she is not committed to the profession. Male attitudes were listed by four women—men were innately prejudiced, or men listened to other men, even if inferior, rather than to women. Each of the following incidents was listed by at least one woman: men were given extras such as consulting jobs; women were envied because of their Ph.D. degrees; women did the work and the male administrators got the credit; women were left out of discussions; women were not given office space or staff support; women had lower status because they worked with children; women were introduced by their first name, while men were introduced as *Dr.* _____ ; there was political rivalry among colleagues; token women were being interviewed to fulfill affirmative action programs; and discrimination occurred because of teaching in a program not accredited by ALA.

The final question was: "Would you name some ways to encourage young women of ability to reach leadership positions in librarianship in the future?" This question was included in the questionnaire for the purpose of securing some guidelines for women seeking positions of leadership in the library profession. Only 24 women did not respond to this question, and another 4 said that they could not suggest any ways. Although most respondents included many suggestions, only one idea was selected from each answer. Some ideas were reiterated frequently, some appeared only once. The most frequently cited advice (given by at least 22 women) was to study and work hard, be prepared to work long hours, and to make sacrifices. It was necessary to go the extra mile, to be a "workaholic."

Somewhat disturbing was the phrase "to work twice as hard as men did, be twice as smart as they were." Education was cited by at least 21 women: a broad general education was essential; secure the proper educational credentials for the job; continue education after graduation by attending workshops; encourage young women through scholarships and internships. Eleven women advised: "always do a good job and be exceptionally well prepared." Another 11 said: "Be mobile, try to be in the right place at the right time. Have your suitcase packed at all times." Nine women suggested each of the following three ideas: (1) be assertive and positive, have confidence in your ability, attend consciousness-raising sessions, and participate in assertiveness-training programs; (2) support and encourage young women of ability, encourage women's groups, establish a "good old girl" network, provide equal opportunities for women with equal pay; and (3) look to women leaders to serve as good role models, study the dossiers of successful people. Specific skills were often mentioned; seven women suggested the need for management and statistical skills, and four cited the need for public speaking and communication skills. Five suggested developing professional contacts through committee work; four suggested publishing books and articles; and four recommended the willingness to accept responsibilities. Two women cited the need to recruit young women of ability to the field first. Two women said do not marry or marry carefully. Some other suggestions included the following, each listed by at least one woman: study the internal politics of your organization, don't be too service-oriented, consider the needs of others, don't mix private and professional life, develop a personal drive and enthusiasm, keep things in their proper perspective, persevere, read only top-notch journals, try to secure the best possible placement in your first professional job, quit encouraging men to join the profession, get out of the profession unless you really "dig it." One woman suggested: "change your sex." One woman answered the question by saying that there was no room at the top. A few quotations are included below in order to convey some idea of the careful thought that the respondents put into answering this last question.

> Be smart, work longer and harder. Always be overly prepared. Have the next higher position in line in order to lay support and financial resources requirements on the line. You can't get anyplace by making demands, not getting them and settling for the same old crumbs. Write, speak, do quality research, be visible and futuristic. Put your name on everything you do and retain a copy. Never discuss family or personal concerns during professional responsibilities. Give and do more than is expected. Hire a male secretary and do not make the coffee or take minutes at a meeting.

• • • • •

Be exceptionally well prepared, forget about looking for discrimination, and plan to do more than your share...and smile and *never* say derogatory things about anyone. Keep one jump ahead of your boss.

• • • • •

...willingness to take a dare, ability to work long hours and do what no one else will do, ability NEVER to feel sorry for oneself—a sense of humor, keep well, have many interests but don't spread yourself too thin. Be active, not afraid to become involved in professional associations, accept offices—write articles, etc.—show ENTHUSIASM for the profession—attitudes are important—you don't need to be subservient, just firm in your step.

• • • • •

Go the extra mile on any job, be positive, don't criticize other librarians, or the public, be proud of your position, your profession, and yourself, go to professional meetings, accept offices and jobs in professional organizations, get to know people in your profession.

Clearly, women librarians who expect to be leaders in the profession must be superwomen. The hard work and sacrifices must be weighed individually by each woman seeking a leadership position. The education and the necessary skills can be obtained. Individual choice may deter some women, but more and more opportunities are available.

## CONCLUSION

The following description of a woman librarian with a doctorate is based on approximately one-half of the population. She has a Ph.D. degree earned since 1970. She completed her Ph.D. in less than five years. Her major subject field for her doctoral work was library or information science, and her master's degree is from a program accredited by ALA. She had from one to ten years of library experience before beginning her doctoral work, but she probably had no experience or less than one year of teaching experience either at the elementary or high school level or at the college or university level. She is equally likely to accept a job in the same city as her doctoral degree-granting institution as in an area beyond the immediate region of this institution. She is involved in library education. Her salary is somewhere between $15,001 and $25,000. Her professional contributions are considerable. She probably has published a book or monograph, a journal article, some reviews, and has delivered at least one paper. She is active on committees at the national, state and local levels. She is a member of the American Library Association, the Association of

American Library Schools and Beta Phi Mu. She was born in the United States, is between 36 and 60 years of age, is just as likely to be single as married, and probably has no children. If married, she has no more than two children.

Three-quarters of the respondents answered the open-ended questions, so the data in this section represent the opinions of less than one-half of the population. Answers were subject to personal interpretation and were difficult to categorize. Over one-half of the women cited a love of books or the encouragement of a specific person as an important factor influencing their choice of librarianship as a career. Not quite one-half would have chosen librarianship as a first career. A large group would have preferred the professional field of medicine, law or business. Lack of encouragement or an unawareness of the field until too late was the most frequently cited factor preventing women from going into their first choice of career. An evolving interest in librarianship and economic circumstances were frequently cited as reasons influencing the change to librarianship. Most women felt that more and different opportunities were open to them after completing the doctorate. Many women reported that nothing prevented them from advancing in the profession, and a few did not seek such advancement. Factors inhibiting advancement included geographical limitations and personal characteristics, such as lack of confidence. The most beneficial influences were the encouragement and expectations of others, and having the proper educational credentials. Although many women reported no incidents of either overt or covert discrimination, about one-third cited instances of overt discrimination and slightly over one-third reported covert incidents of discrimination. Discrimination in hiring and salary differentials were most often cited as both overt and covert incidents of discrimination.

Recommendations and advice for women seeking positions of leadership in the library field in the future included: work hard, get the proper educational credentials, try to be mobile, take courses in assertiveness training, learn management skills, develop ability in public speaking, work on committees, and marry someone who will encourage you in your ambitions. Advice for the women library leaders of today included: support and encourage young women of ability; serve as role models for younger women; recruit young women of ability; help young professionals in placement, especially in their first job; establish an "old girl" network; and perhaps don't go so far as *not* to encourage men to join the profession, but encourage only superior men (who in turn will encourage young women of ability to seek positions of leadership).

## APPENDIX

### Sources Searched for Addresses of the Population

1. *ALA Membership Directory*. Chicago, ALA, 1970-77.
2. "Directory of the Association of American Library Schools," *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, special ed.—1977.
3. Jaques Cattell Pres., ed. *American Library Directory, 1976-1977*. 30th ed. New York, Bowker, 1976.
4. Ash, Lee, ed. *A Biographical Directory of Librarians in the United States and Canada*. 5th ed. Chicago, ALA, 1970.
5. Jaques Cattell Press, comp. *Leaders in Education*. 5th ed. New York, Bowker, 1974.
6. Special Libraries Association. "Annual Directory Issue," *Special Libraries* 67:57s-333s, Oct. 1976; *Special Libraries* 68:65s-364s, Oct. 1977.
7. *The National Faculty Directory 1977, 1978*. 7th and 8th eds. Detroit, Gale Research, 1977.
8. Addresses from alumni offices of library schools.

## REFERENCES

1. The author is indebted to Judith Braunagel and John Ellison, codirectors of the Institute on Women in Library Management held at the State University of New York at Buffalo, June 6-10, 1977, for whom this paper was originally prepared. They gave valuable advice and criticism for the revision of the paper for publication.

2. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, and Japanese Ministry of Labor, Women's and Minors' Bureau. *The Role and Status of Women Workers in the United States and Japan*. Washington, D.C., USGPO, 1976, p. 117.

3. Ibid., p. 138.

4. Ibid., p. 139.

5. Bryant, Barbara E. *American Women Today & Tomorrow*. Washington, D.C., USGPO, 1977, pp. 48-50.

6. U.S. Bureau of the Census. *1970 Census of Population; Subject Reports: Occupational Characteristics* (Final Report PC(2)-7A). Washington, D.C., USGPO, 1973, p. 1.

7. Carpenter, Ray L., and Carpenter, Patricia A. "The Doctorate in Librarianship and an Assessment of Graduate Library Education," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 11:17, Summer 1970.

## VITA

Doris Cruger Dale is a professor, Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. She received her BA and MALS from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and her DLS from Columbia University. She has taught at Columbia and Southern Illinois University. Ms. Dale has been a member of ALA, Illinois Library Association, Illinois Audiovisual Association, Beta Phi Mu, Phi Delta Kappa, Association of American Library Schools, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, and the National Librarians Association. She has written and presented numerous papers on librarianship nationally and several articles for professional journals. Ms. Dale has also written *The United Nations Library: Its Origin and Development* (ALA, 1970) and edited *Carl H. Milam and the United Nations Library* (Scarecrow Press, 1976).